

destroying Medicare than creating jobs.

The Small Business innovation research bill is a good piece of legislation too. That also died in the Senate last month under a pile of unrelated amendments. The bills the Senate passed this year reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration and reforming America's patent system were good legislation also. They would have created or saved about 480,000 jobs. It made it out of the Senate alive but now languishes in the Republican-controlled House. Will the Economic Development Authority suffer the same fate? I hope not.

Here, 24 hours ago, I presented to the American people in the Senate a myriad of amendments that have been filed in regard to this legislation. A lot have been offered but more filed. I read about 40 of them dealing with different types of endangered species, the lesser sand dune reptile. I don't remember what it was, but all kinds of nonrelated amendments. Global warming. Post office reform. As I said, almost 100 amendments, and I read 35 or 40 of them here yesterday, having nothing to do with this legislation. Nothing.

I hope we don't have another bill that is blocked, the fourth this year. If they do that, it would be clear they are more interested in this rightwing ideology than creating much-needed employment. Of the 90-plus amendments, I repeat, only one of which my staff was able to find had any germaneness to the bill, and that is one the chairman of the committee, Senator BOXER, would agree to anyway because it was offered by Senator INHOFE.

This is an important piece of legislation. This legislation will put hundreds of thousands of people to work. So today's vote is again about priorities. Americans have been very clear, job creation is their No. 1 priority, their No. 2 priority, and their No. 3 priority. Democrats share that priority. Republicans obviously don't.

We will never stop bringing jobs bills to the floor, and we will never stop fighting the other side's obstructionism to try to get them passed. Again, Republicans have a different priority, it appears, and that is ending Medicare. And that is too bad. They have worked hard to block three bills that could have created and saved hundreds of thousands of jobs during tough economic times, but they pushed even harder for their ideological plan to kill Medicare as we know it.

The Republican plan would put insurance company bureaucrats between seniors and their doctors. Every senior would pay \$6,400 more for health care in the first year alone. It would force more than 7 million seniors to pay more for cancer screenings, wellness checks, and treatments beginning next year.

Americans have been clear about this too, very clear. They have resoundingly rejected this ideological plan to hurt seniors. Republicans think it is a

bad idea. Democrats think it is a bad idea. And, of course, the Independents think it is a bad idea. All polls show this.

Unfortunately, I haven't heard a shred of evidence that my Republican friends here in Congress are getting the message on Medicare that the American people have gotten. Today they will have a chance to show the American people once again whether they have heard the message on jobs. I hope they have, because so much is at stake. And America is watching.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### KENTUCKY COAL MINERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the floor to report that there were several miners in my State trapped in a mine as a result of floods. I want to start today with an update on that situation.

I am happy to report that all three were rescued after spending 14 hours trapped in a Bell County coal mine. They were all reunited with their families last night, which is great news. Their families were waiting for them at the West Cumberland Baptist Church, and we are certainly glad this particular story had a happy ending.

#### DEBT REDUCTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. This morning, I wish to say a word about the upcoming vote on the debt ceiling and the bipartisan negotiation surrounding it, to reiterate why we are having these talks and what they ought to achieve. But first, a little context.

Right now, ratings agencies are threatening to downgrade U.S. debt, putting us on red alert that the kind of economic crisis we are seeing in parts of Europe could very quickly happen right here.

We know that failing to do something significant about our fiscal problems would be a serious drag on jobs and our economy. That is why, over the past several weeks, I have come to the floor of the Senate and spoken at press conferences, with a now familiar refrain: The time to act on significant reforms is right now. And I have been crystal clear about what qualifies as significant.

Above all, it means doing something to strengthen and preserve our long-term entitlement programs, so we can actually keep our promises to those who have been paying into these programs for years, and so these programs don't end up consuming every single dollar we take in. Entitlements are the biggest drivers of our debt. By definition, they have to be a part of any plan to lower the debt.

This is hardly a controversial view. Everyone from the President on down has said that entitlements must be reformed if we have any chance at all of reining in our debt and strengthening our long-term fiscal health.

In fact, 3 months ago, 31 Senate Democrats signed a letter to the President urging him to put together a plan to reduce the deficit, a plan they said they hoped would include entitlement changes, 31 members of the Democratic conference right here on the other side of the aisle, including the occupant of the chair.

As the occupant of the chair put it recently, "I think it's absolutely clear that we have to redesign our entitlement programs."

Here is how Senator DURBIN put it a few weeks ago: "We have serious economic problems ahead of us if we don't have some reform in both Medicare and Social Security."

This was from former President Bill Clinton after the recent congressional election in New York: "I don't think that the Democrats or the Republicans should conclude from the New York race that no changes can be made in Medicare," he said, "[or] that no changes can be made in Social Security . . . that no changes can be made that will deal with this long-term debt problem."

Here is President Obama's lead negotiator on the debt talks, Vice President BIDEN, from last January: "Everybody talks about we have to do something about Social Security and Medicare, and we do."

Here are the two chairs of the President's debt commission, Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, in a recent op-ed in "Politico": "A credible plan must address the growth of entitlement spending . . ."

Here is the President himself, about a month after he took office: "To preserve our long-term fiscal health we must . . . address the growing costs in Medicare and Social Security."

And, as for me, I have been clear on this same point in public and in private from the moment I stepped out of a meeting with the President and other Members of Congress at the White House on May 12.

So it is not exactly a groundbreaking observation that if these discussions are to mean anything they have to involve entitlement reform since no one believes we actually get at our fiscal problems without it. This is what serious people expect and are hoping for out of these talks.

The moment requires, as I have said for weeks, three things: Real cuts in spending over the short term; that is, over the next 2 years—not more spending increases or "freezes"; real cuts over the medium-term; that is, over the next 10 years with enforceable caps on spending; and meaningful reforms to entitlements, which are the major drivers of our debt. That is the definition of a significant package.

Some Democrats are insisting that they will only agree to cuts if Republicans agree to raise revenue. That is

Washington speak for tax hikes and it is absurd.

First of all, is there anyone outside of Washington, DC, who really thinks that with 14 million people looking for work in this country, the solution is to raise taxes? The last thing you want to do in the middle of a jobs crisis is raise taxes. Does anyone seriously think that is a good idea? Even the President has said as much. It is just common sense. Remember, the President signed the extension of current tax rates back in December with a similar argument.

But even if we weren't in the middle of a jobs crisis, it would be foolish—and completely dishonest. We are in the middle of a debt crisis right now because we spend too much. The solution is to spend less.

How do we know this?

For 30 years beginning in 1971, Federal spending as a percentage of the economy has averaged around 20.8 percent. But after 2 years of out-of-control spending by the President and his Democrat allies in Congress, government spending is now projected to rise a full 4 percentage points above the historical norm.

That may not sound like a lot, but 4 percent of a \$14 trillion economy is an enormous amount of money. Just as the economy sank, Democrats increased government spending by hundreds of billions of dollars. And now they want to make it permanent. That is the reason we have a deficit like we do.

Government spending has gone up, and a bad economy has caused revenue to go down.

That is the reason the debt has gone up 35 percent since the President took office.

Now Democrats want to use that bad economy as an excuse to lock their spending levels in place. They want to use it as an excuse to raise taxes, which would only make the economy worse, cause us to lose even more jobs, and make it even harder to create new jobs.

So let's just be clear about what is going on here. Right now, Washington is borrowing roughly \$4 billion every day above what it collects in taxes. And Democrats don't want to admit we have a spending problem?

We have a national debt the size of our entire economy and Democrats are wondering whether they want to do anything about the biggest drivers of the debt?

Look: Democrats can continue to argue among themselves about whether to step up and address this crisis they have helped create, but they can't argue about what is causing it or what is needed to address it.

Republicans have been crystal clear about where we stand. And Democrats have also been crystal clear about what's needed for these talks to be a success. It is my hope that they consider their own past statements on entitlement reform as we approach the end of these talks.

The path to success is clear. Let's not let this opportunity to do something go to waste.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Arizona.

#### LIBYA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to join the Senator from Massachusetts, who will shortly submit the product of many hours of bipartisan cooperation and negotiation, an authorization for the limited use of military force in Libya. The resolution, as will be introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts, as I mentioned, would authorize the President to employ the U.S. Armed Forces to advance U.S. national security interests in Libya as part of the international coalition that is enforcing U.N. Security Council resolutions in Libya. It would limit this authority to 1 year, which is more than enough time to finish the job, and it makes clear that the Senate agrees with the President that there is no need and no desire to commit U.S. conventional ground forces in Libya.

I will be the first to admit that this authorization is not perfect and it will not make everyone happy. It does not fully make me happy. I would have preferred that this authorization make clear that our military mission includes the President's stated policy objective of forcing Qadhafi to leave power. I would have preferred that it urge the President to commit more U.S. strike aircraft to the mission in Libya so as to help bring this conflict to a close as soon as possible. And I would have preferred that it call on the President to recognize the Transitional National Council as the legitimate voice of the Libyan people so as to free Qadhafi's frozen assets for the Transitional National Council to use on behalf of the Libyan people. I have called on the administration to do all of these things for some time, and I do so now again.

That said, this authorization has been a bipartisan effort. My Republican colleagues and I have had to make compromises, just as have the Senator from Massachusetts and his Democratic colleagues. I believe the end re-

sult is an authorization that deserves the support of my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and I am confident they will support it.

I know the administration has made it clear that it believes it does not need a congressional authorization such as this because it is their view that U.S. military operations in Libya do not rise to the level of hostility. I believe this assertion will strike most of my colleagues and the Americans they represent as a confusing breach of common sense, and it seems to be undercut by the very report the administration sent to Congress which makes clear that U.S. Armed Forces have been and presumably will continue to fly limited strike missions to suppress enemy air defenses, to operate armed Predator drones that are attacking Qadhafi's forces in an effort to protect Libyan civilians, and to provide the overwhelming support for NATO operations, from intelligence to aerial refueling. Indeed, we read in today's New York Times that since the April 7 date that the administration claims to have ceased hostilities in Libya, U.S. warplanes have struck at Libyan air defenses on 60 occasions and fired about 30 missiles from unmanned drones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the article from today's New York Times entitled "Scores of U.S. Strikes in Libya Follow Handoff to Libya."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. I certainly agree that actions such as these do not amount to a full-fledged state of war, and I will certainly grant that I am no legal scholar, but I find it hard to swallow that U.S. Armed Forces dropping bombs and killing enemy personnel in a foreign country does not amount to a state of hostilities.

What is worse, this is just the latest way in which this administration has mishandled its responsibility with regard to Congress. The President could have asked to authorize our intervention in Libya months ago, and I believe it could have received a strong, though certainly not unanimous, show of support.

The administration's disregard for the elected representatives of the American people on this matter has been troubling and counterproductive. The unfortunate result of this failure of leadership is plain to see in the full-scale revolt against the administration's Libya policy that is occurring in the House of Representatives. As I speak now, our colleagues in the House are preparing a measure that would cut off all funding for U.S. military operations in Libya, and they plan to vote on it in the coming days.

I know many were opposed to this mission from the beginning, and I respect their convictions. I myself have disagreed and disagreed strongly at